

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/785,298	02/24/2004	Wayne Thomas McDermott	06472 USA 2078	
23543 AIR PRODUC	7590 06/14/2007 TS AND CHEMICALS	EXAMINER		
PATENT DEP	ARTMENT	KORNAKOV, MIKHAIL		
	ON BOULEVARD I, PA 181951501	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1746	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application I	No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/785,298		MCDERMOTT				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
	·	Michael Korn	akov	1746				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status	·							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Ap</u>							
,	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.	•						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-34 is/are withdraw	vn from consid	leration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
-	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requir	ement.					
Applicat	ion Papers		•					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
* (application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	-		ad				
		or the certified	r copies not receive	su.				
Attachmen		Α.	Intonian Comme	/PTO 442\				
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	-,	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di Notice of Informal F Other:	ate				

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Applicants' election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-23, in the reply filed on 04/03/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no serious burden on the examiner to examine both the apparatus claims and the process claims. Applicants submit, that the examination of Groups I, II and III would not present an undue burden on the Examiner because allegedly a search for ultrasonic processing systems would yield references that detail the method of how such ultrasonic processing systems are used. This is not found persuasive because of several reasons:
- a) while patentability search of the apparatus requires the search of its structural elements, the patentability search of the method is concerned with the steps (or actions) of the method;
- b) the classification of the apparatuses presented in Group I and methods presented in Groups II and III are totally different and this fact conclusively proves the existence of an undue burden on the examiner;

Therefore, Applicants' arguments that the search of one invention must necessarily result in a search of the other one has been considered, but is not found persuasive insofar as the searches are not co-extensive and additional search would of necessity be required for the combination of inventions.

Art Unit: 1746

With regard to Applicants' request that, upon identification of allowable subject matter of the elected *product* claims, the non-elected *method of using claims* commensurate in scope with the allowed product claims be rejoined in accordance with MPEP § 821.04, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner NEVER made a restriction between the product and the process of using. Contrary the restriction was made between the process and apparatus for its practice. As such, Applicants' request is deemed without merits.

The restriction requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Since 37 CFR 1.142(a) provides that restriction is proper at any stage of prosecution up to a final action, a second requirement may be made when it becomes proper, even though there was a prior requirement with which applicant complied, consult. Ex parte Benke, 1904 C.D. 63, 108 O.G. 1588 (Comm'r Pat. 1904).

Therefore, a new restriction requirement *WITHIN PREVIOUSLY ELECTED GROUP I* is imposed at this time.

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-9 drawn to an ultrasonic probe, classified in class 366, subclass
 127.
 - II. Claim 11, drawn to a different ultrasonic probe, classified in class 428, subclass various.
 - III. Claims 10, 12-23, drawn to an ultrasonic processing system, classified in class 310, subclass 328.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Application/Control Number: 10/785,298 Page 4

Art Unit: 1746

3. Inventions of Group I and Group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination of Group II can be used as a probe holder and the subcombination of Group I has separate utility such as ultrasonic probe. The subcombinations do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

4. Inventions III and I are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the

Art Unit: 1746

particulars of the probe of Group I as claimed and the subcombination has separate utility such as an ultrasonic probe.

- 5. Inventions III and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require the specificities of the shoulder support sections of Group II. The subcombination has separate utility such as probe holder.
- 6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 8. If the invention of Group I is elected, Group I contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the species reciting the cross section of the probe as per claim 6 or claim 7. The species are independent or distinct because in each case they recite a specific and distinct characteristic of the diameter of the probe.

Art Unit: 1746

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 5 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

9. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 1746

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Kornakov whose telephone number is (571) 272-1303. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Michael Kornakov Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746

06/07/07

M. KODNAKON